

## REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated June 15, 2006, having a shortened statutory period set to expire September 15, 2006. Proposed amendments include cancelling Claims 1-17 and adding Claims 18-35. Upon entry of the proposed amendments, Claims 18-35 will be pending.

### Claim Objections

In paragraphs 2 and 3, Claims 3 and 12-13 is objected to for presenting cumulative subject matter. In paragraph 4, Claim 14 is objected to for a typographical error (an extra comma). These claims are now cancelled, and thus objections are moot.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraph 6 of the present Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyoshi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0049703 – “Miyoshi”) in view of Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). In paragraph 7 of the present Office Action, Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyoshi and Bell in further view of Berstis (U.S. Patent No. 6,018,345 – “Berstis”). In paragraph 8 of the present Office Action, Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyoshi and Bell in further view of Otsuka (U.S. Patent No. 5,579,126 – “Otsuka”). In paragraph 9 of the present Office Action, Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyoshi and AAPA in further view of Mical (U.S. Patent No. 4,772,882 – “Mical”). In paragraph 10 of the present Office Action, Claims 8, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,048 – “Tanaka”) in view of AAPA. In paragraph 11 of the present Office Action, Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Berstis. In paragraph 12 of the present Office Action, Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of AAPA and Miyoshi. In paragraph 13 of the present Office Action, Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyoshi.

All rejected claims are cancelled, and thus the rejections are moot. However, Applicants do not believe that a combination of the cited art teaches or suggests all limitations of the newly proposed claims.

*Miyoshi* teaches a method for printing a Web page based on a “Read-Ahead” program, which sends control numbers (which are numbers that are assigned to particular Web pages to be printed – see paragraph [0039]) with Web pages to a printer (see paragraph 0043)).

*Berstis* teaches changing a mouse pointer to a “Go” pointer when the original mouse pointer is positioned over a hot link on a Web page.

*Otsuka* teaches printing sequential files from a list.

*Mical* is cited for teaching the use of a menu list, and for reading a menu by clicking a mouse.

*Tanaka* teaches printing push and pull print jobs.

With regards to exemplary **Claim 18**, the cited art does not teach or suggest “displaying a link to a file on a browser screen” (as supported in the present specification on page 12, lines 23-24 and FIG. 3a); “in response to detecting that a mouse pointer is positioned over the link, determining if the file is a Portable Document Format (PDF) file” (supported on page 10, lines 5-7 and page 12, lines 24-26); “in response to determining that the file is a PDF file, displaying a PDF indicator near the link on the browser screen” (supported on page 10, lines 27-28); “in response to detecting a click of the PDF indicator, presenting, on the browser screen, a menu screen that includes a first print option and a second print option, wherein selecting the first print option directly stores the PDF file to a storage unit, and wherein selecting the second print option stores a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) address, which references the PDF file, to the storage unit” (supported by FIG. 3b and page 10, lines 9-16); and “printing PDF files from the storage unit by push printing stored PDF files and pull printing PDF files through use of stored URL addresses” (supported on page 12, lines 7-9 and page 14, lines 1-17).

With regards to exemplary **Claim 19**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest “presenting a third option on the menu screen, wherein selecting the third option directly

causes a list, of all PDF files that are print pending, to be displayed on the browser screen,” as supported by FIGs. 4a-b and page 12, lines 13-15 of the present specification.

With regards to exemplary **Claim 20**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest “wherein the third option cannot be executed until a determination has been made by a user that all print target PDF files have been selected and all print target PDF file addresses have been stored as a print list in the storage unit,” as supported on page 13, line 20 to page 14, line 4.

With regards to exemplary **Claim 21**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest “wherein the click of the PDF indicator is a right-click of a mouse,” as supported on page 8, lines 28-29.

With regards to exemplary **Claim 22**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest “wherein the PDF indicator replaces the mouse pointer being displayed on the browser screen,” as supported on page 10, lines 28-29.

With regards to exemplary **Claim 23**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest “wherein the menu screen replaces the PDF indicator being displayed on the browser screen,” as supported on page 11, lines 6-8.

With regards to exemplary **Claim 24**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest “A system comprising: a browser screen for displaying a link to a file” (as supported by element 33 in FIG. 1); “a Portable Document Format (PDF) direct print control unit for, in response to a determination that a mouse point is positioned over the link, determining if the file is a PDF file” (supported by element 64 in FIG. 2); “a data display unit for, in response to a determination that the file is a PDF file, displaying a PDF indicator near the link on the browser screen” (supported by element 73 in FIG. 2 and on page 10, lines 10-13); “a plug-in unit for, in response to detecting a click of the PDF indicator, presenting, a menu screen that includes a first print option and a second print option, wherein selecting the first print option directly stores the PDF file to a storage unit, and wherein selecting the second print option stores a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) address, which references the PDF file, to the storage unit” (supported by element 63 in FIG. 2); and “a data transmission unit for transmitting, to a printer, stored PDF

files and stored URL addresses, wherein the stored URL addresses are associated with referenced PDF files” (supported by element 74 in FIG. 2 and page 10, lines 13-14).

With regards to exemplary **Claim 30**, a “computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program” is supported by element 34 of FIG. 2 and page 4, lines 19-24.

### CONCLUSION

As the cited prior art does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the pending claims, Applicants now respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The present amendment is filed contemporaneously with a Petition to Revive an Unintentionally Abandoned Application. As such, no additional extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application to **IBM CORPORATION DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. 50-3669**.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Boice  
Registration No. 44,545  
DILLON & YUDELL LLP  
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway  
Suite 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)